

DEC 07 2006

Applicant : James D. Pravetz  
Serial No. : 10/072,260  
Filed : February 6, 2002  
Page : 15 of 21

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-497001/P461

### REMARKS

Claims 1-20 and 23-51 are pending, of which claims 1, 9, 13, 30, 38, 42, and 50 are independent. Claims 1, 9, 30, 38, 42, and 50 are amended. Reconsideration of the action mailed August 7, 2006, is requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-7, 9-10, 12-17, 19, 23-28, 30-36, 38-39, 41-46, 48 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Jilk, Jr. et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0010746 ("Jilk") in view of Dusse et al., RFC 2311 ("Dusse").

Claims 8, 11, 18, 20, 29, 37, 40, 47, 49, and 51 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable over Jilk and Dusse further in view of The PDF Reference, 2nd ed. ("PDF Reference").

### Interview Summary

The applicant wishes to thank the examiner for the courtesy of an interview conducted October 31, 2006. The applicant's representative Brian Gustafson and Examiner Szymanski participated in the interview. Claim 1 was discussed with respect to the cited references of Jilk and Dusse. The applicant's representative described the invention and the differences from Jilk and Dusse. In particular, the applicant's representative described how Jilk fails to disclose two distinct applications to generate and transmit, respectively, a container object. Additionally, the examiner clarified his reading of Jilk and Dusse. No agreement was reached.

### Section 103 Rejections

Claim 1 stands rejected over Jilk and Dusse. Claim 1, as amended, recites, in part, that a first application on a client generates a container object, and a second application distinct from the first application but also on the client transmits the container object to a recipient's address.

Jilk discloses an e-mail proxy server. See paragraph 82. A user sends to the e-mail proxy server an e-mail which specifies a web page and, optionally, form field values. See paragraph 121. The e-mail proxy server downloads the web page in accordance with the browser settings and e-mails the web page back to the user. Before e-mailing the web page back to the user, the e-mail proxy server modifies the web page so that it properly displays in the user's e-mail client.

Applicant : James D. Pravetz  
Serial No. : 10/072,260  
Filed : February 6, 2002  
Page : 16 of 21

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-497001/P461

See paragraph 111. For example, links to images on the web are replaced with references to images attached to the e-mail. See paragraph 161.

In the interview, the examiner clarified his position that the first and second applications of claim 1 can be found either at the user side or the proxy server side of Jilk. The applicant respectfully disagrees and will address both situations in turn.

On the user side, Jilk discloses an e-mail client, which requests and receives web pages using an e-mail application. See paragraphs 96-97. A user can request a web page by sending an e-mail to the proxy server including the desired web address in the subject of the e-mail message. See FIG. 3a and 6; paragraphs 96 and 116. When requesting a web page, only a single client application is invoked.

Alternatively, the user can receive a requested web page by e-mail. See FIG. 7; paragraph 97. The proxy server converts the web page prior to transmission to the client so that the web page is viewable using the e-mail application. See paragraphs 97 and 111. Alternatively, the client can include a browser application that is used to display the web content received by the e-mail application. See paragraph 187.

However, the requesting and receiving of web pages on the client does not disclose or suggest a first application on a client generating a first container object and a second application on the client, distinct from the first application, transmitting the first container object to a recipient's address. In Jilk, sending the request for a web page involves only one application: the e-mail application. There is no container object generated by a first application and transmitted using a second distinct application (*i.e.*, no container object generated by one application and then transmitted by the e-mail application).

Receiving the web content from the proxy server can include both a first application (e-mail application) and a second application (client browser). However, when receiving content at the user, a container object is not generated by either application. Furthermore, neither application transmits a container object to a recipient.

Claim 1 also recites that the first application automatically obtains a second container object from the second application. As set forth above, Jilk discloses an implementation using

Applicant : James D. Pravetz  
Serial No. : 10/072,260  
Filed : February 6, 2002  
Page : 17 of 21

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-497001/P461

two applications on the user side: an e-mail application which can be manually operated by a user to display web pages in an external web browser. See paragraph 187. This implementation, however, fails to remedy the deficiency of the relied-upon portion of Jilk. Paragraph 187 of Jilk reads as follows, emphasis added:

Although an implementation of the present invention can be used with an e-mail browser that does not display HTML (for example, older versions of Eudora and Eudora Pro, or the Pine e-mail reader for UNIX), in some cases the capabilities are more limited. Specifically, it can be used to request a URL from the Web server 507, and the resulting Web page will be delivered to the e-mail browser as an attachment. The Web page can then be viewed by launching the attachment through a Web browser, or by saving the attachment to a file and opening it with a Web browser. In some circumstances the e-mail browser will be capable of accepting "form post" operations that occur through the Web browser client, and in these circumstances the full capabilities of the invention are available with the assistance of the Web browser client. In these cases and others, one embodiment as detailed herein accommodates this type of usage. However, alternate embodiments within the scope of the invention, including but not limited to the use of different MIME types and a modified procedure for transcoding the Web page for e-mail, may provide improved capabilities with some such e-mail browser and Web browser combinations.

This paragraph clearly describes a "more limited" mode of operation, where the user must manually view the attachment. In this limited mode of operation, the user can manually launch the attachment into a web browser or manually save the attachment to disk and then manually launch the attachment into a web browser. While paragraph 187 also discusses "some circumstances" where the "full capabilities of the invention" are purportedly available, Jilk clarifies that this refers to the ability to submit web forms by use of the e-mail client. Paragraph 187 fails to teach or suggest automating the process of viewing web page attachments from the e-mail client in the web browser.

By contrast, claim 1 recites that the first application automatically obtains a second container from the second application. Jilk discloses that a browser application can be manually activated to display web content received in an e-mail message, but does not disclose or suggest that the web browser automatically obtains a container object from the e-mail application.

Applicant : James D. Pravetz  
Serial No. : 10/072,260  
Filed : February 6, 2002  
Page : 18 of 21

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-497001/P461

Turning now to the proxy server, Jilk discloses receiving an e-mail message from a client user requesting a web page, obtaining the requested web page, and returning the web page to a client user in an e-mail message. *See e.g.*, paragraph 97. In order to send the web page to the requesting user, the web page is transcoded in a format viewable in an e-mail message. *See* paragraphs 97 and 111.

However, Jilk does not disclose a first application on the proxy server that generates a container object and a second, distinct, application on the proxy server that transmits the container object to a recipient. The web page is provided as the body of an e-mail message, thus even if a browser on the proxy server corresponds to the claimed first application, it does not generate the claimed container object, where generating the container object includes putting a certificate or request in the container object. Furthermore, no container object is generated which is then transmitted by a second distinct application.

Similarly, the e-mail application of the proxy server can be considered to generate a container object (*i.e.*, the e-mail message). However, the claim requires that the container object be transmitted by a application that is distinct from the generating application. Jilk does not disclose or suggest that and e-mail container object is transmitted by another distinct application.

Additionally, Jilk also fails to disclose or suggest a proxy server including a first application that automatically obtains a second container object from the second application. The e-mail application of the proxy server receives e-mail requests for web pages. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion that the web page request is a container object. Jilk discloses the request as text within the body of the e-mail message (*e.g.*, in the subject line). Instead, the e-mail message can be considered a container. However, even if the received e-mail message is a container, Jilk does not disclose or suggest another application on the proxy server that automatically obtains the e-mail message. The request is provided to a web browser in order to retrieve the desired web page, but this is not the same as receiving the e-mail "container". Jilk does not disclose or suggest a container object being provided to the web browser, only that the web browser interprets the e-mail to read the request. *See e.g.*, paragraphs 84 and 100.

Applicant : James D. Pravetz  
Serial No. : 10/072,260  
Filed : February 6, 2002  
Page : 19 of 21

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-497001/P461

Dusse fails to remedy the deficiency of Jilk. The examiner does not rely on Dusse for the feature of a first application that generates a container object and uses a second application distinct from the first application to transmit the container object. Indeed, the relied upon portion of Dusse merely discloses a monolithic "sending agent" and the sending agent's counterpart on the other end, a monolithic "receiving agent." *See, e.g.,* Dusse § 2.3.

Claim 1 also recites automatically identifying and extracting one or more certificates from within the second container object. The examiner states that Jilk does not disclose or suggest certificates, but that Dusse does at RFC 2311 §§ 2.4.2-2.5; 2.6.1, 3-3.1, 4.1; and RFC 2312 §§ 2.3 and 4. The cited sections describe the general structure and operation of Secure MIME ("S/MIME"). Insofar as the applicant can determine, the discussion in the cited sections with respect to receiving certificates is limited to § 4.

Section 4 of Dusse reads, in pertinent part, as follows:

A receiving agent needs to provide some certificate retrieval mechanism in order to gain access to certificates for recipients of digital envelopes. There are many ways to implement certificate retrieval mechanisms. X.500 directory service is an excellent example of a certificate retrieval-only mechanism that is compatible with classic X.500 Distinguished Names. The PKIX Working Group is investigating other mechanisms. Another method under consideration by the IETF is to provide certificate retrieval services as part of the existing Domain Name System (DNS). Until such mechanisms are widely used, their utility may be limited by the small number of correspondent's certificates that can be retrieved. At a minimum, for initial S/MIME deployment, a user agent could automatically generate a message to an intended recipient requesting that recipient's certificate in a signed return message.

The cited section of Dusse discloses techniques for obtaining a certificate when the user does not have the certificate of an intended recipient. Dusse suggests that the X.500 directory can be used to request and retrieve certificates for individuals listed in the directory from a central location. The cited section also states an alternative means of retrieving a certificate is to send a request for a certificate directly to the intended recipient.

These techniques, however, describe receiving a certificate that the user does not possess. Claim 1, in contrast, discloses automatically identifying and extracting a certificate which has already been received by the client in the second container object. The cited portions of Dusse

Applicant : James D. Pravetz  
Serial No. : 10/072,260  
Filed : February 6, 2002  
Page : 20 of 21

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-497001/P461

do not disclose or suggest techniques for automatically identifying and extracting certificates from received container objects.

For each of the foregoing reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claims 9, 30, and 38 contain similar limitations and are therefore allowable. Claims 2-8, 10-12, 23-29, 31-37, and 39-41 depend from these claims are therefore allowable.

Claim 5 stands rejected over Jilk and Dusse. Claim 5 recites, in part, receiving input from a sender selecting one or more of the sender's multiple certificates to include in a container object. The examiner states that Dusse discloses a user input selecting one or more sender certificates at §§ 2.3 and 4. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Section 2.3 discloses that a sender can have multiple certificates, but does not disclose or suggest a user input selecting one or more of the sender's certificates to include in a container object. Section 4 discloses a database for storing received certificates of others, but does not disclose or suggest a user input selecting one or more of the sender's certificates to include in a container object. The applicant respectfully submits that claim 5 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 13 stands rejected over Jilk and Dusse. Claim 13 recites, in part, automatically determining if the first container object includes a request for a certificate of the recipient and if a request is included in the first container object, then responding to the request. The examiner states that Dusse discloses automatically determining if a container object includes a request for a certificate at §§ 2.3, 4, and 4.2.

However, none of the cited sections of Dusse disclose or suggest determining if a container object includes a request for a certificate. Section 2.3 discloses that a receiving agent must be able to receive an arbitrary number of certificates and that sending agents should include certificates in outgoing messages. Section 2.3 does not disclose or suggest a receiving a certificate request or the automatic determination that a container object includes a request for a certificate.

Section 4, as discussed above, discloses techniques for retrieving a certificate including sending a request for a certificate. However, this does not address the recipient of such a request

Applicant : James D. Pravetz  
Serial No. : 10/072,260  
Filed : February 6, 2002  
Page : 21 of 21

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-497001/P461

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 07 2006

nor the determination that a container object includes a request. Finally, § 4.2 discloses automated certificate chain validation. This describes validating part of a process for validating a public key. *See* §4.2. However, the process involves already having the certificate. The cited section does not disclose or suggest a request for a certificate or the automatic determination that a container object includes a request for a certificate.

Jilk fails to remedy the deficiency. As the examiner notes on page two of the Office Action, Jilk fails to teach or suggest the exchange of certificates.

The applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 is in condition for allowance. Claims 42 and 50 recite limitations corresponding to those of claim 13 and are therefore also allowable. Claims 14-20, 42-49, and 51 depend from claims 13, 42, and 50 and are therefore allowable.

#### Conclusion

The applicant requests that all pending claims be allowed.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7 December 2006

Brian J. Gustafson  
Brian J. Gustafson  
Reg. No. 52,978

Customer No.: 021876  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
Telephone: (650) 839-5070  
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50368207.doc